Estimating parameters of nonlinear systems using the elitist particle filter based on evolutionary strategies

Christian Huemmer, Christian Hofmann, Roland Maas, and Walter Kellermann

arXiv:1604.04198v4 [stat.ML] 25 May 2016

***Abstract*—In this article, we present the elitist particle filter based on evolutionary strategies (EPFES) as an efficient approach for nonlinear system identification. The EPFES is derived from the frequently-employed state-space model, where the relevant information of the nonlinear system is captured by an unknown state vector. Similar to classical particle filtering, the EPFES consists of a set of particles and respective weights which represent different realizations of the latent state vector and their likelihood of being the solution of the optimization problem. As main innovation, the EPFES includes an evolutionary elitist-particle selection which combines long-term information with instantaneous sampling from an approximated continuous posterior distribution. In this article, we propose two advancements of the previously-published elitist-particle selection process. Further, the EPFES is shown to be a generalization of the widely-used Gaussian particle filter and thus evaluated with respect to the latter for two completely different scenarios: First, we consider the so-called univariate nonstationary growth model with time-variant latent state variable, where the evolutionary selection of elitist particles is evaluated for non-recursively calculated particle weights. Second, the problem of nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation is addressed in a simulated scenario with speech as input signal: By using long-term fitness measures, we highlight the efficacy of the well-generalizing EPFES in estimating the nonlinear system even for large search spaces. Finally, we illustrate similarities between the EPFES and evolutionary algorithms to outline future improvements by fusing the achievements of both fields of research.**

***Index Terms*—state-space model, nonlinear system identification, elitist particles, particle filter, evolutionary strategies**

I. Introduction

THE identification of time-varying nonlinear systems based on noisy measurements has been investigated for several decades and is still an active research topic [1]–[3]. The main challenge of such supervised identification tasks are unknown systems of nonlinear characteristics which preclude analytical solutions of statistically optimal estimation techniques, e.g. based on the minimum mean square error (MMSE) criterion. This is why a variety of different approaches have been proposed, which can be categorized in the following way: First, the nonlinear characteristics of the unknown system are deterministically approximated using local linearisation or functional approximation techniques to derive analytically tractable estimation algorithms. Very popular examples for these kinds of algorithms are the extended Kalman filter [4], Kernel methods [5]–[7] and estimation techniques for Hammerstein group models [8]–[10] and Volterra filters [11]–[13].

Multimedia Communications and Signal Processing, Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg (FAU), Cauerstr. 7, 91058 Erlangen, Germany, e-mail: {huemmer,hofmann,maas,wk}@LNT.de, R. Maas was with the FAU while the work has been conducted. He is now with Amazon, Seattle, WA.

The authors would like to thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) for supporting this work (contract number KE 890/4-2).

In the second category, an analytically-intractable estimation technique is approximated using sequential Monte Carlo approaches, like particle filters [14]–[17]. These numerical sampling methods capture nonlinear relations between non-Gaussian-distributed random variables by representing a probability distribution with a finite set of particles and respective weights (likelihoods). On the one hand, such particle filters allow for a flexible and mathematically complex way of modeling the nonlinear dynamics of an unknown system. On the other hand, particle filters are computationally expensive as a high estimation accuracy requires a large number of particles. However, many real-time implementations of particle filtering in the fields of tracking, robotics or biological engineering highlight the increased applicability with growing computational power and the use of parallel processing units [18]–[24]. The classical particle filter (proposed more than 20 years ago [25]) has been refined in a variety of publications, see overview articles such as [26]–[29]. In general, particle filtering is derived from the well-known state-space model, where the relevant information about the unknown system is modeled by a latent state vector and where the posterior distribution of the state vector is modeled as a discrete probability density function (PDF) (consisting of a finite set of particles and respective weights). This leads to the approximation of statistically optimal estimation techniques and the well-known problems of degeneracy and sample impoverishment, where the set of particles is represented by a few members with large weights and many particles with negligible weights. To address these issues, different concepts have been proposed which can be assigned to two categories, namely resampling methods [30]–[32] and posterior-distribution approximations (by using a continuous PDF, see [33]).

In this article, we present and advance the elitist particle filter based on evolutionary strategies (EPFES) which selects elitist particles by means of long-term fitness measures and introduces innovation into the set of particles by sampling from an approximated continuous posterior PDF [34]. As the EPFES will be shown to be a generalization of the widely-used Gaussian particle filter [33] (this relation has not been considered so far), we evaluate the conceptional differences with respect to the latter for two completely different state-space models. Thereby, the EPFES is shown to achieve a remarkable performance for the practically-relevant case of a small number of samples and to outperform the Gaussian particle filter for two completely different scenarios. Finally, we consider the EPFES from a different point of view and show similarities to basic features of evolutionary algorithms. This comparison motivates further improvements of the EPFES by fusing the advantages of both concepts.

This article is organized as follows: In Section II, we briefly review classical particle filtering from a Bayesian network perspective and emphasize how it differs from linear adaptive filtering concepts like the normalized least mean square (NLMS) algorithm. This is followed by the derivation and advancement of the EPFES in Section III, where we introduce the EPFES as generalization of Gaussian particle filtering. The experimental evaluation in Section IV is divided into two parts: first, we consider the Univariate Nonstationary Growth Model (UNGM) to study the tracking capabilities of the EPFES without using long-term information. Second, we address the task of nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation (AEC), where we identify nonlinear loudspeaker signal distortions by exploiting the generalization properties of the EPFES, improving the system identification performance even for large search spaces. This is followed by an outlook in Section V, where we motivate further refinements of the proposed elitist-particle selection of the EPFES by highlighting parallels to evolutionary algorithms. Finally, conclusions are drawn in Section VI.

II. Classical particle filtering for nonlinear system identification

Throughout this article, the Gaussian probability density function (PDF) of a real-valued length-M random vector with mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{z},n}$ and covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{z},n}$, dependent on the time instant n, is denoted as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{z}_n &\sim \mathcal{N}\{\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{z},n}, \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{z},n}\} \\ &= \frac{|\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{z},n}|^{-1/2}}{(2\pi)^{M/2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{(\mathbf{z}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{z},n})^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{z},n}^{-1} (\mathbf{z}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{z},n})}{2}\right\},\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $|\cdot|$ represents the determinant of a matrix. Furthermore, $\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{z},n} = C_{\mathbf{z},n}\mathbf{I}$ (with identity matrix $\mathbf{I}$) implies the elements of $\mathbf{z}_n$ to be mutually statistically independent and of equal variance $C_{\mathbf{z},n}$.

For clarity, we make the following additional assumptions with respect to the experimental verification in Section IV: First, we restrict the uncertainties in the process and the observation equation to be additive random variables, and the observation d_n to be a scalar real-valued random variable. Second, all vectors have real-valued entries.

In the following, assume the relevant information of a nonlinear system to be captured by the length-R state vector

$$\mathbf{z}_n = [z_{0,n}, z_{1,n}, ..., z_{R-1,n}]^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{2}$$

with coefficients $z_{\nu,n}$ and $\nu = 0, ..., R-1$. This unobservable or latent vector depends on the time instant $n = 1, ..., N$ and its temporal evolution is described by the process equation

$$\mathbf{z}_n = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}_{n-1}) + \mathbf{w}_n, \tag{3}$$

where $\mathbf{f}(\cdot)$ represents the so-called nonlinear progress [25]. The uncertainty of the state vector is denoted as $\mathbf{w}_n$ and is of same dimension as $\mathbf{z}_n$ in (3). The relationship between the state vector $\mathbf{z}_n$ and the observation d_n is described by

$$d_n = \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{x}_n, \mathbf{z}_n) + v_n, \tag{4}$$



Fig. 1. Bayesian network of a state-space model

where $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ represents a nonlinear function which also depends on the length-M input signal vector

$$\mathbf{x}_n = [x_n, x_{n-1}, ..., x_{n-M+1}]^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{5}$$

with time-domain samples x_n. Furthermore, the uncertainty of the observation d_n in (4) is modeled by the additive variable v_n. Throughout this article, we assume $\mathbf{w}_n$ and v_n to be normally distributed and of zero mean:

$$\mathbf{w}_n \sim \mathcal{N}\{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{w},n}\}, \quad v_n \sim \mathcal{N}\{0, \sigma_{v,n}^2\}. \tag{6}$$

From a Bayesian network perspective, this probabilistic model corresponds to the graphical model shown in Fig. 1, where the observed input signal vector $\mathbf{x}_n$ is omitted for notational convenience in the later probabilistic calculus ($\mathbf{x}_n$ specifies the value of the function $\mathbf{g}(\cdot)$ and is thus captured by d_n). In Fig. 1, the directed links express statistical dependencies between the nodes whereas observed variables, such as d_n, are marked by shaded circles. The estimate of the state vector $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n$ is derived as

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n = \underset{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n}{\operatorname{argmin}}\, \mathcal{E}\{||\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n - \mathbf{z}_n||_2^2\}, \tag{7}$$

reflecting the MMSE criterion, where $||\cdot||_2$ is the Euclidean norm and $\mathcal{E}\{\cdot\}$ the expectation operator. As characteristic for Bayesian MMSE estimation, the minimization of (7) with respect to $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n$ yields the mean vector of the posterior PDF $p(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n})$ as estimate for the state vector

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n = \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\}, \tag{8}$$

where $d_{1:n} = d_1, ..., d_n$. In the case of linear relations between the variables in (3) and (4), and for a linear estimator for $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n$, the MMSE estimate of (7) leads to the Kalman filter equations [35] and - under further assumptions on the statistics of the random variables - to the NLMS algorithm with an adaptive stepsize value [36].

However, if the process equation (3) or the observation equation (4) exhibit nonlinear structure, we cannot derive the Bayesian estimate of $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n$ in (8) in a closed-form analytical way. Thus, we employ the particle filter to approximate the posterior PDF

$$p(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}) = \frac{p(d_n|\mathbf{z}_n)p(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n-1})}{\int p(d_n|\mathbf{z}_n)p(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n-1})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{z}_n} \tag{9}$$

by a discrete distribution [35], [37]

$$p(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}) \approx \sum_{l=1}^{L} \frac{p(d_n|\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)})\delta(\mathbf{z}_n - \mathbf{z}_n^{(l)})}{\sum_{l=1}^{L} \int p(d_n|\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)})\delta(\mathbf{z}_n - \mathbf{z}_n^{(l)})\mathrm{d}\mathbf{z}_n} \quad (10)$$

$$= \sum_{l=1}^{L} \omega_n^{(l)} \delta(\mathbf{z}_n - \mathbf{z}_n^{(l)}), \quad (11)$$

where $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Dirac delta distribution and $l = 1, ..., L$. Based on (11), the set of L particles $\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)}$ is characterized by the weights

$$\omega_n^{(l)} = \frac{p(d_n|\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)})}{\sum_{l=1}^{L} p(d_n|\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)})}, \quad (12)$$

which describe the likelihoods that the observation is obtained by the corresponding particle. These likelihoods are used as measures for the probability of the samples to be drawn from the true PDF [38]. Finally, the estimate for the state vector

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n = \mathcal{E}\{\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\} \approx \sum_{l=1}^{L} \omega_n^{(l)} \mathbf{z}_n^{(l)} \quad (13)$$

is given as the estimated mean vector of the approximated posterior PDF. This fundamental concept is illustrated in Fig. 2 and follows the explanation in [34]. As starting point of this iterative estimation method, L samples $\mathbf{z}_0^{(l)}$ are drawn from the initial PDF $p(\mathbf{z}_0)$ and inserted into the time update of (3) to determine the particles $\mathbf{z}_1^{(l)}$. Then, we calculate the particle weights $\omega_1^{(l)}$ following (12). With this set of particles and their associated weights, the estimate $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_1$ and the discrete distribution $p(\mathbf{z}_1|d_1)$ are determined based on (13) and (11), respectively. This PDF is the basis for the sampling procedure of the following time step, in which the estimation procedure is repeated. As shown by the circular structure in Fig. 2, the starting point for classical particle filtering is a finite number of L samples $\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)}$ which are subsequently evaluated in terms of their likelihood producing the observations d_n [27]. This leads to three problems (Pr1, Pr2 and Pr3) which will be summarized in the following.

Pr1 - High computational load: It is well known in the particle-filtering community that both estimation accuracy and computational cost increase with the number of L particles [27], [28]. One approach to avoid a dissatisfying tradeoff is the selection of elitist particles by dropping all particles with weights smaller than a specific threshold [39].

Pr2 - Degeneracy and sample impoverishment: The cyclic evaluation of a finite set of particles (indicated in Fig. 2) results in the problem of degeneracy which implies that many particles have negligible weights after a few iteration steps. To address this issue, resampling methods have been introduced which remove the particles with low weights. This leads to the so-called sample impoverishment, where the set of particles shrinks to a few members with large weights. Approaches tackling both problems of degeneracy and sample impoverishment can be categorized as follows: In the first category, sophisticated resampling methods like dynamic resampling [40] or the use of particle-distribution optimization techniques [41] constitute an important step for making particle filters perform well in many practical scenarios [30]–[32], [42]. However, these modifications of the classical particle filter are associated with a high computational load [29], [43], [44]. In the second category, methods like the Gaussian particle filter proposed in [33] approximate the posterior PDF as a continuous distribution, so that a dedicated sampling strategy inherently prevents the problems of degeneracy and sample impoverishment.



Fig. 2. Concept of the classical particle filter

Pr3 - Generalization: In addition to the described limitations, the intention of classical particle filtering (as initially proposed for tracking applications [25]) has been to solve the instantaneous optimization problem without generalizing the instantaneous solution. This is effected by (12), where the particle weights are calculated considering only the observation likelihood $p(d_n|\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)})$ at time instant n. This property of classical particle filtering is a disadvantage for the identification of high-dimensional systems that have a distinct static or slowly time-varying component. To give an example, assume that the entries of the state vector $\mathbf{z}_n$ to be modeled are random variables with time-invariant mean vector and time-variant uncertainty (e.g., modeled by additive Gaussian random variables of zero mean). The intention of classical particle filtering is to solve the instantaneous solution of the optimization problem without generalization to the global solution. Then, in particular, the resulting system estimate is not necessarily converging to the mean vector of the latent state vector (and thus not identifying an unbiased estimate for the unknown system). A more detailed description is part of Section IV-B.

III. The EPFES for nonlinear system identification

In this section, we present the elitist particle filter based on evolutionary strategies (EPFES) with the goal to overcome the previously described problems Pr1, Pr2 and Pr3 of classical particle filtering. First, the properties of the EPFES are explained in detail followed by an algorithmic realization and an overview on the optimization parameters. Second, the EPFES is shown (by proper choice of two parameters) to lead to the Gaussian particle filter.

A. Properties of the EPFES

In this part, we introduce the properties S1, S2 and S3 of the EPFES motivated by the classical particle filter's problems Pr1, Pr2 and Pr3 (see previous section), respectively.

S1 - Selection of elitist particles: Motivated by problem Pr1, we define a selection process associated with the so-called "natural selection" [45] following evolutionary strategies (ES): At time instant n, we consider the set of L samples $\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)}$ and corresponding weights $\omega_n^{(l)}$. In the selection process, the samples with a weight value smaller than a threshold $\omega_{\text{th},n}$ are dropped [39]. Due to its widespread use in evolutionary game theory, we propose to employ the weight average as adaptive threshold [46], [47]

$$\omega_{\text{th},n} = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \omega_n^{(l)}, \tag{14}$$

which is novel compared to our previous work ($\omega_{\text{th},n}$ as time-invariant tuning parameter [34]). The remaining set of $Q_n \leq L$ selected samples represents the set of so-called elitist particles [48] $\mathbf{z}_{\text{el},n}^{(q)}$ and is characterized by the normalized weights

$$\omega_{\text{el},n}^{(q)} = \frac{p\left(d_n|\mathbf{z}_{\text{el},n}^{(q)}\right)}{\sum\limits_{q=1}^{Q_n} p\left(d_n|\mathbf{z}_{\text{el},n}^{(q)}\right)}, \tag{15}$$

where $q = 1, ..., Q_n$[1]. Based on (13), the estimate of the state vector is given as weighted superposition of the elitist particles

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n = \sum_{q=1}^{Q_n} \omega_{\text{el},n}^{(q)} \mathbf{z}_{\text{el},n}^{(q)}. \tag{16}$$

S2 - Innovation by mutation: To cope with problem Pr2, the estimated state vector $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n$ is employed to approximate the discrete distribution $p\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$ by a continuous PDF $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$, as proposed for the Gaussian case in [33] and is discussed below (see Table II). This has the advantage of addressing degeneracy and sample impoverishment without introducing resampling methods: By drawing $R_n = L - Q_n$ samples $\mathbf{z}_{\text{in},n}^{(r)}$ ($r = 1, ..., R_n$) from the approximated distribution $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$, we introduce innovation by refilling the set of particles. In the terminology of evolutionary strategies (ES), this introduction of innovation can be identified as mutation. Finally, the time update is realized by drawing samples from $p(\mathbf{z}_{n+1}|\mathbf{z}_n = \bar{\mathbf{z}}_n^{(l)})$ [33], where $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_n^{(l)}$ denotes the refilled set of samples. Based on the process equation in (3), this leads to [33]

$$\mathbf{z}_{n+1}^{(l)} = \mathbf{f}\left(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_n^{(l)}\right) + \mathbf{w}_n^{(l)} \quad \text{for} \quad l = 1, ..., L \tag{17}$$

with samples $\mathbf{w}_n^{(l)}$ drawn from the PDF $p(\mathbf{w}_n)$.

S3 - Long-term fitness measures: The evaluation of the particles following (12) yields an instantaneous estimate of the particle weights. As discussed in problem Pr3, it might be of interest for the identification of high-dimensional systems with slowly time-varying components to incorporate information about the previous time instants into the particle evaluation as well. For this, we employ the following weight calculation based on the assumption of a normally distributed observation uncertainty v_n in (6) (detailed derivation in the appendix):

$$\omega_n^{(l)} = \frac{\exp\left(\hat{\omega}_n^{(l)}\right)}{\sum\limits_{l=1}^{L} \exp\left(\hat{\omega}_n^{(l)}\right)}, \quad \hat{\omega}_n^{(l)} = \lambda \hat{\omega}_{n-1}^{(l)} + (1-\lambda)\tilde{\omega}_n^{(l)}. \tag{18}$$

Therein, we estimate the instantaneous update as

$$\tilde{\omega}_n^{(l)} = \frac{(d_n - \mathbf{g}\{\mathbf{z}^{(l)}\})^2}{c_{\sigma,n}}, \quad c_{\sigma,n} = -2\sigma_{v,n}^2 \frac{1-\lambda}{1+\lambda}, \tag{19}$$

initialize $\hat{\omega}_1^{(l)} = \tilde{\omega}_1^{(l)}$ and thus define $\hat{\omega}_{n-1}^{(l)} = \tilde{\omega}_{n-1}^{(l)}$ for set of non-elitist particles $\mathbf{z}_{\text{in},n-1}^{(r)}$ drawn at the time instant $n-1$.



Fig. 3. Concept of the EPFES with approximated posterior PDF

An overview of the EPFES is given in Fig. 3. In comparison to the classical particle-filter concept in Fig. 2, the discrete distribution is replaced by an approximated continuous PDF $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$ and the evolutionary selection process is integrated, which facilitates the introduction of innovation into the set of particles by taking samples from $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$. Note that this evolutionary selection process intends to capture dynamic nonlinearities by mutation and time-invariant system components by the evolutionary selection with recursively-calculated particle weights.

B. Realization of the EPFES

In this section, we illustrate the practical implementation of the EPFES by considering the overview shown in Table I. We start with a finite set of L samples $\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)}$ and respective values $\hat{\omega}_{n-1}^{(l)}$ estimated in (18). First, the particle weights are recursively updated by inserting (19) into (18). Then, we select Q_n elitist particles $\mathbf{z}_{\text{el},n}^{(q)}$ with weights larger than $\omega_{\text{th},n}$ in (14) and consider the following distinction for estimating the posterior PDF $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$: If no elitist particles have been selected ($Q_n = 0$), the entire set of (non-elitist) particles and respective weights $\{\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)}, \omega_n^{(l)}\}$ is employed to approximate the posterior PDF $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$ with mean vector $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n$ calculated according to (13). In case of $Q_n > 0$, we estimate the posterior PDF $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$ using the set of Q_n elitist particles and respective weights $\{\mathbf{z}_{\text{el},n}^{(q)}, \omega_{\text{el},n}^{(q)}\}$, where the mean vector $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n$ is determined according to (16). To give an example for the estimation of the posterior PDF, consider the special case of $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right) \approx \mathcal{N}\{\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{z},n}\}$ shown in Table II. Finally, the R_n non-elitist particles are replaced by samples drawn from the posterior PDF $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$ and the time update realized following (17).

[1]Time dependencies of sample indices are omitted for simplicity.

TABLE I
OVERVIEW ON THE IMPLEMENTATION STEPS OF THE EPFES

Starting point: L samples $\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)}$ and estimates $\hat{\omega}_{n-1}^{(l)}$

Step 1: Calculate particle weights $\omega_n^{(l)}$ according to (18)

Step 2: Select Q_n **elitist particles** with weights larger than $\omega_{\text{th},n}$ in (14)

Step 3: Estimate posterior PDF $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$ **with mean vector** $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n$

if $Q_n > 0$

– Normalize weights of elitist particles according to (15)

– Use elitist particles to estimate $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$

else

– Use all particles to estimate $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$

end

Step 4: Introduce innovation

– Replace non-elitist particles by samples from $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$

– Calculate $\hat{\omega}_{\text{th},n} = \tilde{\omega}_{\text{th},n}$ for the new samples following (19)

Step 5: Determine $\mathbf{z}_{n+1}^{(l)}$ using the time update of (17) $\rightarrow n = n+1$

Note that in principle, the realization of the EPFES is not restricted to approximating the posterior PDF by a Gaussian probability distribution. For instance, a uniform posterior PDF has been shown in [34] to be promising for the task of nonlinear AEC. However, in this article we focus on a Gaussian probability distribution as approximation for the posterior PDF to directly establish the link between the EPFES and the Gaussian particle filter in the following section.

C. Gaussian particle filter as a simple special case

The Gaussian particle filter has been applied to a variety of applications (see e.g. [49]–[52]) and conceptionally differs from classical particle filtering (reviewed in Section II) by approximating the posterior PDF as Gaussian probability distribution [33]. The following assumptions A1 and A2 simplify the EPFES to the Gaussian particle filter proposed in [33]:

A1 - Gaussian posterior PDF: The approximated posterior PDF is assumed to be a Gaussian probability distribution

$$\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right) \approx \mathcal{N}\{\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{z},n}\}, \tag{20}$$

where we estimate the mean vector $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n$ and the covariance matrix $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{z},n}$ as summarized in Table II (see Section III-B for more details about the realization of the EPFES).

A2 - No elitist particles ($Q_n = 0$): The evolutionary selection mechanism is deactivated by setting the threshold to

$$\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1. \tag{21}$$

This leads to $Q_n = 0$ (no elitist particles are selected) and the approximation of the posterior PDF $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$ using the entire set of L particles and its respective weights. As shown in Table II, all L particles $\mathbf{z}_n^{(l)}$ are subsequently replaced by new samples drawn from the approximated PDF $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right)$. This implies that for the Gaussian particle filter it is not possible to evaluate particles based on long-term fitness measures. Besides the choice of a Gaussian posterior PDF in (20), the major conceptional extension of the EPFES with respect to the Gaussian particle filter is the evolutionary selection of elitist particles which is active for $0 \leq \omega_{\text{th},n} < 1$. This evolutionary choice of elitist particles provides the opportunity to evaluate samples based on long-term fitness measures. To this end, the smoothing factor λ in (18) can be chosen dependent on the specific scenario. The impact of the evolutionary selection process on the system identification performance of the EPFES will be investigated for two different scenarios in Section IV.

TABLE II
SAMPLING AS PART OF THE EPFES WITH APPROXIMATED POSTERIOR PDF $\hat{p}\left(\mathbf{z}_n|d_{1:n}\right) \approx \mathcal{N}\{\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{z},n}\}$, WHERE WE DIFFERENTIATE WITH RESPECT TO THE NUMBER OF Q_n ELITIST PARTICLES

$Q_n > 0$	$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n = \sum_{q=1}^{Q_n} \omega_{\text{el},n}^{(q)} \mathbf{z}_{\text{el},n}^{(q_n)}$ $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{z},n} = \frac{1}{Q_n} \sum_{q=1}^{Q_n} (\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n - \mathbf{z}_{\text{el},n}^{(q)})(\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n - \mathbf{z}_{\text{el},n}^{(q)})^{\text{T}}$ $\rightarrow$ Draw $L - Q_n$ samples from $\mathcal{N}\{\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{z},n}\}$
$Q_n = 0$	$\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n = \sum_{l=1}^{L} \omega_n^{(l)} \mathbf{z}_n^{(l)}$ $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{z},n} = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} (\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n - \mathbf{z}_n^{(l)})(\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n - \mathbf{z}_n^{(l)})^{\text{T}}$ $\rightarrow$ Draw L samples from $\mathcal{N}\{\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n, \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{\mathbf{z},n}\}$

IV. EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

In this section, we focus on evaluating the system identification performance of the EPFES. In particular, we follow the assumption A1 of the previous section and consider a Gaussian posterior PDF defined in (20) with parameter estimation summarized in Table II. Thus, the commonly employed Gaussian particle filter is represented by the special case of $\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1$ and employed as reference algorithm to evaluate the system identification improvement using the evolutionary elitist-particle selection process.

The evaluation is split into two parts, where the respective structures of process and observation equations are described in Table III: Task A represents a widely-used application of classical particle filtering, where a latent state variable z_n is quickly changing over time with an additive uncertainty w_n of large variance. This removes the need for employing long-term fitness measures, so that the EPFES is realized by setting the smoothing factor λ in (18) equal to 0. In Task B, we model the temporal progress of a slowly-varying latent state vector $\mathbf{z}_n$ by a linear process equation including an additive uncertainty $\mathbf{w}_n$. As a result of this, we apply the EPFES to verify the

TABLE III
OVERVIEW OF BOTH TASKS INCLUDING THE STRUCTURES OF PROCESS AND OBSERVATION EQUATIONS

	Task A, Section IV-A	Task B, Section IV-B
Process equation	$z_n = f\left(z_{n-1}\right) + w_n$	$\mathbf{z}_n = \mathbf{z}_{n-1} + \mathbf{w}_n$
Observation equation	$d_n = g\left(z_n\right) + v_n$	$d_n = \mathbf{g}\left(\mathbf{z}_n\right) + v_n$

generalization properties of the instantaneous solution of the optimization problem dependent on the smoothing factor λ in the weight update of (18). To this end, we modify the length of the vector $\mathbf{z}_n$ to evaluate the system identification performance of the EPFES for different sizes of the search space.

A. Univariate Nonstationary Growth Model (UNGM)

In order to evaluate the elitist-particle selection of the EPFES without recursively calculated particle weights, we consider a frequently employed benchmark system, known as UNGM. The UNGM has been employed in [33] to compare the system identification performance of the Gaussian particle filter with the unscented Kalman filter, the extended Kalman filter and sequential importance sampling with resampling.
The UNGM is described by the observation equation

$$d_n = \frac{z_n^2}{20} + v_n \quad \text{with} \quad v_n \sim \mathcal{N}\{0,1\} \tag{22}$$

relating d_n to the latent state variable z_n by a quadratic function and a normally distributed observation uncertainty v_n. The UNGM's temporal progress of the state variable is modeled by the process equation:

$$z_n = \alpha z_{n-1} + \beta \frac{z_{n-1}}{1+z_{n-1}^2} + \gamma \cos(1.2(n-1)) + w_n, \tag{23}$$

which is a nonlinear time-variant function dependent on the parameters α, β, γ as well as on the additive uncertainty w_n chosen as follows [33]:

$$w_n \sim \mathcal{N}\{0,1\}\,,\ \alpha = 0.5,\ \beta = 25,\ \gamma = 8. \tag{24}$$

To emphasize the time-variant characteristics of the latent state variable, one realization of the process equation for $N = 100$ time instants is illustrated in Fig. 4.
As a measure to evaluate the system identification performance, we use the mean square error

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{KN} \sum_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{n=1}^{N} (z_n - \hat{z}_{n,k})^2 \tag{25}$$

between the state variable z_n and its estimate $\hat{z}_{n,k}$, averaged over K realizations of the same experiment. This is motivated by the variance in the system identification performance of sequential Monte Carlo methods like the Gaussian particle filter due to the numerical sampling from a continuous PDF [33]. As shown for the Gaussian particle filter in Fig. 5, the resulting variations in evaluation measures like the MSE can be reduced by taking long-term averages, where we choose $N = 10^6$ and $K = 50$ in the following.



Fig. 4. Realization of the process equation in (23) with the parameter settings of (24) for $N = 100$ time instants.



Fig. 5. Simulation results for the MSE defined in (25) with $K = 1$, where we realize the same experiment 50 times to evaluate the impact of choosing $N = 1000$ or $N = 10^6$ iteration steps on the variations of the MSE.

The parameters of the EPFES are chosen as follows:

- The particle weights in (18) are calculated in a non-recursive way by setting $\lambda = 0$. This is motivated by the strongly time-variant observation and process equation combined with additive uncertainties v_n and w_n of large variance, cf. (22) and (24). The resulting oscillations in the temporal evolution of both state variable z_n and observation d_n removes the need for using long-term fitness measures.
- The threshold $\omega_{\text{th},n}$ is estimated following (14). To realize the Gaussian particle filter as reference algorithm, the threshold is set to $\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1$.

The simulation results for the MSE defined in (25) are shown in Fig. 6 in dependence of the number of L particles. Besides the well-known tendency that the system identification performance increases for higher values of L, we experience that the EPFES achieves lower MSE scores compared to the Gaussian particle filter. This performance gain of the EPFES reduces with increasing number of L and is most pronounced for the practically-relevant case of a small set of L particles (see MSE values in Table IV). Note that the computational complexity of the EPFES is comparable with respect to the Gaussian particle filter, as the additional number of real-valued multiplications to calculate the threshold in (14) and to normalize the elitist weights in (15) is almost compensated by the reduced number of elitist particles to calculate the MMSE estimate in (16).

Summary of Task A: We evaluated the system identification performance of the EPFES using the UNGM as benchmark system with strongly time-variant observation and process equation. By setting the smoothing factor λ to zero, it is shown that, in comparison with the Gaussian particle filter, the system identification improvement achieved by the EPFES is most prominent for a small number of L particles (see Table IV).



Fig. 6. Simulation results for the MSE defined in (25) for two different choices of estimating the parameter $\omega_{\text{th},n}$, where $\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1$ represents the Gaussian particle filter (GPF), $N = 10^6$ and $K = 50$.

TABLE IV
MSE OF THE EPFES AND THE GAUSSIAN PARTICLE FILTER (GPF) ACCORDING TO (25) DEPENDENT ON THE NUMBER OF L PARTICLES.

Threshold	$L = 10$	$L = 20$	$L = 50$	$L = 100$
$\omega_{\text{th},n}$ in (14)	35.4	21.2	13.9	12.6
$\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1$ (GPF)	41.3	31.1	15.4	12.7

B. Nonlinear Acoustic Echo Cancellation (AEC)

In this section, we consider the scenario for nonlinear AEC shown in Fig. 7 as a real-world example for the identification of a slowly time-varying nonlinear system. The goal is to identify the electro-acoustic echo path (from the loudspeaker to the microphone) for simultaneously active near-end interferences. Here, nonlinear loudspeaker signal distortions created by transducers and amplifiers in minituarized loudspeakers reduce the performance of linear echo path models. As such nonlinearly distorting loudspeakers are followed by a linear transmission path through air, modeling the overall echo path as a nonlinear-linear cascade is a reasonable approximation [53]. The structure of this Hammerstein system is shown in the left half of Fig. 7, where a memoryless preprocessor realizes an element-wise transformation of the input vector

$$\mathbf{x}_n = [x_n, x_{n-1}, ..., x_{n-M+1}]^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{26}$$

(with time-domain samples x_n) to the output vector $\mathbf{y}_n$ of equal length. Motivated by the good performance in nonlinear AEC [10], [36], [54], we choose a polynomial preprocessor based on odd-order Legendre functions of the first kind:

$$\mathbf{y}_n = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_n) = \mathbf{x}_n + \sum_{\nu=1}^{3} \hat{a}_{\nu,n} \cdot \mathcal{L}_{2\nu+1}\{\mathbf{x}_n\}, \tag{27}$$

which is parameterized by the estimated vector

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n = [\hat{a}_{1,n}, \hat{a}_{2,n}, \hat{a}_{3,n}]^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{28}$$

with coefficients $\hat{a}_{\nu,n}$, where $\nu = 1, 2, 3$. The acoustic path at time n between loudspeaker and microphone is estimated by the linear finite impulse response (FIR) filter

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_n = [\hat{h}_{0,n}, \hat{h}_{1,n}, ..., \hat{h}_{M-1,n}]^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{29}$$



Fig. 7. The NL-AEC scenario with memoryless preprocessor and linear FIR filter $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_n$, where $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_n$ is estimated by the NLMS algorithm according to (30).

using the NLMS algorithm:

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{n+1} = \hat{\mathbf{h}}_n + \frac{\mu}{\mathbf{y}_n^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_n + \epsilon}\, \mathbf{y}_n e_n, \tag{30}$$

with the scalar stepsize μ, a positive constant ϵ to avoid division by zero and the error signal $e_n = d_n - \hat{d}_n$ relating the observation d_n and its estimate $\hat{d}_n = \hat{\mathbf{h}}_n^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{y}_n$ [55].
It should be emphasized that the adaptation of a Hammerstein system is highly appropriate for investigating the generalization properties of the EPFES: The adaptation of the linear subsystem $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_n$ in (30) depends on the preprocessor output $\mathbf{y}_n$ and thus strongly depends on the performance of the EPFES, estimating the preprocessor coefficients $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{n+1}$.
For the identification of the memoryless preprocessor, we apply the concept of significance-aware (SA) filtering initially proposed in [10]: The linear subsystem (represented by the estimated room impulse response (RIR) vector $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_n$) is split into the direct-path peak region

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{p},n} = [\hat{h}_{I-T,n}, ..., \hat{h}_{I+T,n}]^{\mathrm{T}} \tag{31}$$

and the complementary part

$$\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{c},n} = [\hat{h}_{0,n}, ..., \hat{h}_{I-T-1,n}, \hat{h}_{I+T+1,n}, ..., \hat{h}_{M-1,n}]^{\mathrm{T}}, \tag{32}$$

based on the time lag I of the energy peak in $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_n$ [10], where $I \geq T$. As exemplarily shown in Fig. 8, the direct-path part $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{p},n}$ is of length $M_{\mathrm{p}} = 2T + 1 < M$ and the remaining part $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{c},n}$ is of length $M - M_{\mathrm{p}}$. As indicated in Fig. 9, this concept of splitting $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_n$ into the two components $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{p},n}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{c},n}$ is similarily applied to the input vector $\mathbf{x}_n$ to define the signal vectors $\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{p},n}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{c},n}$, respectively [54]. As a consequence of this, the direct-path microphone signal component

$$d_{\mathrm{p},n} = d_n - \hat{d}_{\mathrm{c},n} = d_n - \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{c},n}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{f}\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{c},n}, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_n\right) \tag{33}$$

can be introduced as an observed random variable which depends only on the direct-path component of the nonlinear echo path, $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{p},n}$, because the influence of the remaining part $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{c},n}$ is assumed to be removed via (33). This leads to the NL-AEC scenario shown in Fig. 9, where we estimate the preprocessor coefficients based on the error signal

$$e_n = d_{\mathrm{p},n} - \hat{d}_{\mathrm{p},n} = d_{\mathrm{p},n} - \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{p},n}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{f}\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{p},n}, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_n\right) \tag{34}$$

between the direct-path microphone signal component $d_{\mathrm{p},n}$ and its estimate $\hat{d}_{\mathrm{p},n} = \hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{p},n}^{\mathrm{T}}\mathbf{f}\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{p},n}, \hat{\mathbf{a}}_n\right)$. Thus, we derive a computationally-efficient realization of the EPFES by modeling the direct-path component of the nonlinear echo path as



Fig. 8. Example for splitting $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_n$ into the direct-path peak region $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{p},n}$ and the complementary part $\hat{\mathbf{h}}_{\mathrm{c},n}$ with $I = 12$, $M_{\mathrm{p}} = 5$ and $M = 61$.



Fig. 9. The NL-AEC scenario with memoryless preprocessor and linear FIR filter, where the parameter vector $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n$ is estimated using the direct-path microphone signal component $d_{\mathrm{c},n}$.

latent state vector (note that this has been denoted in [54] as SA-EPFES to differentiate it from modeling the entire nonlinear echo path) based on ...

- the latent length-3 vector $\mathbf{a}_n$ modeling the coefficients of the preprocessor and
- the latent length-M_p vector $\mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{p},n}$ modeling the direct-path component of the RIR vector (to circumvent estimation errors of the NLMS adaptation in (30)).

Consequently, the state vector is defined as

$$\mathbf{z}_n = [\mathbf{a}_n^\mathrm{T}, \mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{p},n}^\mathrm{T}]^\mathrm{T} \tag{35}$$

and thus of length $M_\mathrm{z} = M_\mathrm{p} + 3$ to model the direct-path component of the nonlinear echo path.
This leads to the observation equation

$$d_{\mathrm{p},n} = \mathbf{g}\left(\mathbf{z}_n\right) + v_n = \mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{p},n}^\mathrm{T}\mathbf{f}\left(\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{p},n}, \mathbf{a}_n\right) + v_n, \tag{36}$$

precluding a closed-form analytical derivation of the MMSE estimate $\hat{\mathbf{z}}_n$ [54]. At this point, we like to emphasize the appropriateness of the observation model in (36): The length M_p of the direct-path component $\mathbf{h}_{\mathrm{p},n}$ is a parameter which can be modified to investigate the system identification performance of the EPFES for different sizes M_z of the search space (according to the definition of the state vector in (35)). As we do not assume to have any priori knowledge about the temporal evolution of the state vector, the process equation is defined as

$$\mathbf{z}_n = \mathbf{z}_{n-1} + \mathbf{w}_n \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{w}_n \sim \mathcal{N}\{\mathbf{0}, C_\mathbf{w}\mathbf{I}\}, \;\; C_\mathbf{w} = 0.01, \tag{37}$$

where the state vector $\mathbf{z}_n$ is modeled to be time-invariant up to an additive, zero-mean uncertainty $\mathbf{w}_n$.
The experimental setup consists of a synthesized scenario using a measured RIR vector $\mathbf{h}$ at a sampling rate of 16 kHz, additive white Gaussian noise v_n with a long-term SNR of 10 dB and 18 seconds of female speech as nonstationary input signal. The nonlinear loudspeaker signal distortion is chosen as

$$\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_n) = 1/4 \cdot \tanh(4\mathbf{x}_n), \tag{38}$$

which has been employed in [54], [56] and leads to a linear-to-nonlinear power ratio of around 9 dB.

As evaluation measure, we choose the time-dependent echo return loss enhancement (ERLE_n)

$$\mathrm{ERLE}_n = 10\log_{10}\left(\mathcal{E}\{d_n^2\}/\mathcal{E}\{e_n^2\}\right) \tag{39}$$

and stop the filter adaptation after 9 seconds. This allows to evaluate the online performance during the first half of the signal and should illustrate how well the instantaneous solution generalizes during the second half, which is an indicator for the actual system identification performance. For a fair comparison, we fix the parameters of the NLMS adaptation for all experiments to

$$M = 254, \quad \mu = 0.5, \quad \epsilon = 10^{-4}, \tag{40}$$

and set $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_n = [0, 0, 0]^\mathrm{T}$ during the first 0.1 seconds to facilitate an initial convergence of the NLMS algorithm. Afterwards, we employ the ERLE_n defined in (39) to investigate the impact of the preprocessor estimation (by applying the EPFES) for the identification of the Hammerstein system.

The following evaluation is split into three parts, where each subsection considers a different EPFES configuration dependent on the length M_z of the latent state vector $\mathbf{z}_n$ and the number of L particles:

- Configuration C1: $M_\mathrm{z} = 14$, $L = 100$
- Configuration C2: $M_\mathrm{z} = 44$, $L = 100$
- Configuration C3: $M_\mathrm{z} = 44$, $L = 20$

For each of these EPFES configurations C1, C2 and C3, we compare three EPFES parametrizations P1, P2 and P3 dependent on the threshold $\omega_{\mathrm{th},n}$ and the smoothing factor λ:

- Parametrization P1: $\omega_{\mathrm{th},n} = 1$ (Gaussian particle filter)
- Parametrization P2: $\omega_{\mathrm{th},n}$ in (14), $\lambda = 0.5$
- Parametrization P3: $\omega_{\mathrm{th},n}$ in (14), $\lambda = 0.7$

Configuration C1 ($M_\mathrm{z} = 14$, $L = 100$): The ERLE_n for the described realizations of the EPFES is shown in Fig. 10, where we can observe an improved system identification performance with respect to the Gaussian particle filter ($\omega_{\mathrm{th},n} = 1$) by including the evolutionary selection process. The increased performance during the first 9 seconds highlights the excellent tracking abilities of the EPFES, while the improved system identification after 9 seconds states that the EPFES generalizes the instantaneous solution of the optimization problem very well. Interestingly, the system identification improves with increasing value of the smoothing factor λ. To investigate this behavior in more detail, we consider the estimated parameter values $\hat{a}_{\nu,n}$ of the memoryless preprocessor during the first 9 seconds shown in Fig. 11(a)-(c) (for the parametrizations P1, P2, and P3, respectively). As can be seen in Fig. 11(a), the estimated coefficients $\hat{a}_{\nu,n}$ are highly oscillating over time which implies that the Gaussian particle filter solves the instantaneous solution of the optimization problem without identifying the true values of the coefficients. Comparing this to parametrization P2 shown in Fig. 11(b), we notice the dynamic changes are still present but smaller in amplitude. As a consequence of this, the evolutionary selection of elitist



Fig. 10. Simulation results for the ERLE$_n$ defined in (39) for three different choices of the parameters $\omega_{\text{th},n}$ and λ, where $\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1$ represents the Gaussian particle filter (GPF), $M_z = 14$ and $L = 100$ (Configuration C1).



Fig. 12. Simulation results for the ERLE$_n$ defined in (39) for three different choices of the parameters $\omega_{\text{th},n}$ and λ, where $\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1$ represents the Gaussian particle filter (GPF), $M_z = 44$ and $L = 100$ (Configuration C2).



(a) Simulation results for P1: $\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1$ (Gaussian particle filter)



(b) Simulation results for P2: $\omega_{\text{th},n}$ in (14), $\lambda = 0.5$



(c) Simulation results for P3: $\omega_{\text{th},n}$ in (14), $\lambda = 0.7$

Fig. 11. Estimated coefficients of the preprocessor in (27) for three different choices of the parameters $\omega_{\text{th},n}$ and λ, where $\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1$ represents the Gaussian particle filter, $M_z = 14$ and $L = 100$ (Configuration C1).

particles provides a much more stable result. This effect is even more pronounced for increasing λ, which effectively employs more long-time information for judging particles to be within the set of elitist particles (see the results for parametrization P3 shown in Fig. 11(c)). The average ERLE$_n$ of the Hammerstein system using the EPFES ($\omega_{\text{th},n}$ in (14), $\lambda = 0.7$) and the Gaussian particle filter ($\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1$) for estimating the memoryless preprocessor are shown in the first row of Table V. Note that the average ERLE$_n$ might be larger in the second half of the experiment (9 s - 18 s in Table V) due to the initial convergence phase.

Configuration C2 ($M_z = 44$, $L = 100$): In this experiment, we evaluate the impact of an increased length of the state vector on the system identification performance of the Hammerstein system with an EPFES-estimated memoryless preprocessor. Note that the simulation results in Fig. 12 confirm the statement of Configuration C1 that the system identification performance improves with increasing value of λ. Interestingly, the increased length of the state vector leads to a significant decrease in the ERLE$_n$ after freezing the filter coefficients at the time instant of 9 seconds if the threshold is set to $\omega_{\text{th},n} = 1$ (Gaussian particle filter). This indicates a worse generalization of the Gaussian particle filter with increasing search space which can be successfully prevented by introducing the evolutionary selection process of the EPFES: the comparison of Fig. 10 and Fig. 12 reveals that the EPFES is hardly affected by the increased search space. This underlines the extraordinary suitability of the EPFES also for optimization problems in higher-dimensional search spaces and is also clearly stated by a quantitative comparison of the average ERLE$_n$ values in the second row of Table V.

Configuration C3 ($M_z = 44$, $L = 20$): Finally, we investigate the identification of the Hammerstein system for estimating the preprocessor coefficients with a reduced number of $L = 20$ particles. As shown in Fig. 13, the ERLE_n resulting from the Gaussian particle filter ($\omega_{\mathrm{th},n} = 1$) is significantly reduced with respect to Fig. 12. Interestingly, the EPFES with evolutionary selection process has a remarkable system identification performance comparable to its realization with $L = 100$ particles in Configuration C2. Fore more details, consider the average ERLE_n for online adaptation and frozen filter coefficients summarized in Table V. These results imply that the EPFES generalizes very well and robustly even for a small number L of particles, which is an important property for an efficient realization in practical applications.

Summary of Task B: The system identification performance of an Hammerstein system with EPFES-estimated memoryless preprocessor preceding an NLMS-adapted linear FIR filter was evaluated by choosing three configurations C1, C2 and C3 with different values for the length of the state vector and the size of the set of particles. In sum, it could be shown in comparison to the Gaussian particle filter that the EPFES ...

- generalizes the instantaneous solution of the optimization problem very well (cf. C1 in Table V),
- shows a remarkable system identification performance even for high search spaces (cf. C1 to C2 in Table V),
- requires only a small set of particles for getting a robust estimate of the state vector (cf. C1 to C3 in Table V).

These statements are emphasized by the quantitative comparison of the average ERLE_n values for instantaneous filter adaptation and frozen filter coefficients (after 9 seconds) shown in Table V.



Fig. 13. Simulation results for the ERLE_n defined in (39) for three different choices of the parameters $\omega_{\mathrm{th},n}$ and λ, where $\omega_{\mathrm{th},n} = 1$ represents the Gaussian particle filter (GPF), $M_z = 44$ and $L = 20$ (Configuration C3).

TABLE V
AVERAGE ERLE_n OF THE HAMMERSTEIN SYSTEM USING THE EPFES (P3) AND THE GAUSSIAN PARTICLE FILTER (P1) TO ESTIMATE THE MEMORYLESS PREPROCESSOR, ADAPTATION STOPPED AFTER 9 SECONDS.

Parametrization	P3: $\omega_{\mathrm{th},n}$ in (14), $\lambda = 0.7$		P1: $\omega_{\mathrm{th},n} = 1$ (GPF)	
Time frame	0 s - 9 s	9 s - 18 s	0 s - 9 s	9 s - 18 s
Config. C1	23.7 dB	26.1 dB	22.1 dB	16.1 dB
Config. C2	23.6 dB	26.0 dB	22.0 dB	11.6 dB
Config. C3	22.8 dB	24.9 dB	14.4 dB	3.5 dB

V. EXTENSIONS OF THE EPFES

So far, the EPFES has been derived from the well-known state-space model as a generalization of the Gaussian particle filter. The proposed evolutionary selection process includes a replacement of non-elitist particles of weights smaller than the threshold $\omega_{\mathrm{th},n}$. It seems intuitive that employing a more sophisticated selection procedure could further improve the system identification performance of the EPFES. Therefore, we consider the EPFES from a different perspective by comparing its properties to basic features of evolutionary algorithms which are optimization techniques inspired by the natural evolution of biological organisms [57]:

- *Selection:* Similar to the EPFES described in Section III-A, evolutionary algorithms realize a selection of population members based on their respective fitness scores. Extensive research has been made to improve the selection procedure (e.g., *fitness scaling* [58] or *ranking selection* [59]).
- *Replacement:* As the size of the population is constant [60], the selection process of evolutionary algorithms is followed by replacing specific members dependent on their current fitness scores. However, the choice of an elitist group with the highest fitness scores (and a replacement of the members with the lowest fitness scores) is a special case following the so-called *replacement-of-the-worst strategy* [57]. In the theory of evolutionary algorithms, also different replacement procedures could be applied (with the goal to increase the diversity of the population), where most state-of-the-art techniques can be assigned to the so-called *crowding methods* [61].
- *Mutation and recombination:* In evolutionary algorithms, the steps of mutation and recombination consider the introduction of innovation and the inheritance of genetic information from parents to children, respectively [62]–[64].

Besides a smarter selection of elitist-particles (see e.g. [65], [66]), we expect an adaptive estimation of the smoothing factor λ in (18) (see e.g. [67]) as very promising for further improving the system identification performance of the EPFES.

VI. Conclusion

In this article, we introduced the EPFES as a promising approach for nonlinear system identification. Similar to the classical particle filter, the EPFES consists of a set of particles and corresponding weights which represent different realizations of the latent state vector and their likelihood to be the solution of the optimization problem. To cope with conceptional disadvantages of the classical particle filter, the EPFES includes an evolutionary selection of elitist particles based on long-term fitness measures. To introduce innovation, the non-elitist particles are replaced by samples drawn from an approximated continuous posterior PDF which solves the problems of degeneracy and sample impoverishment. With these properties, the EPFES is shown to be a generalized form of the widely-used Gaussian particle filter.

In this article, we propose two advancements of the EPFES by introducing an adaptive (instead of manually optimized) threshold for the elitist-particle selection and deriving long-term fitness measures from a theoretical perspective (instead of using an intuitive heuristic motivation [34]).

The EPFES proved to outperform the Gaussian particle filter for two completely different nonlinear state-space models: First, we considered the UNGM with a scalar state variable (quickly changing over time) to investigate the evolutionary selection process of the EPFES without using long-term fitness measures. Second, the task of nonlinear AEC has been addressed for evaluating the generalization properties of the EPFES even for large search spaces. Both experiments emphasize the remarkable system identification performance of the EPFES and show the optimization possibilities as generalized form of the Gaussian particle filter. In particular, the EPFES generalizes the instantaneous solution of the optimization very well. This is the case not only for large spaces but also for a small set of particles which highlight the efficacy in obtaining robust estimates for an unknown system.

In future, the system identification performance of the EPFES could be further improved by incorporating well-studied selection and replacement strategies from the field of evolutionary algorithms. Reversely, the use of long-term fitness measures (a feature of the EPFES) might also be of interest for extending evolutionary algorithms.

Appendix
Derivation of long-term fitness measures

As discussed in Section III-A, it might be of interest for the identification of high-dimensional systems with slowly time-varying components to incorporate information about the previous time instants into the particle evaluation as well. For this task, we consider a state vector $\mathbf{z}$ which is time-invariant in the interval $n = 1, ..., N$ and produces the observations $d_{1:n}$. The starting point for deriving the particle weights is similar to classical particle filtering by drawing L samples $\mathbf{z}^{(l)}$ from the posterior PDF $p(\mathbf{z}|d_0)$. With the goal to derive long-term fitness measures, we assume all samples $\mathbf{z}^{(l)}$ to be elitist particles and thus not to be replaced during the interval $n = 1, ..., N$. Under these assumptions, the posterior PDF $p(\mathbf{z}|d_{1:N})$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} p(\mathbf{z}|d_{0:N}) &= \frac{p(d_{1:N}|\mathbf{z}, d_0)p(\mathbf{z}|d_0)}{\int p(d_{1:N}|\mathbf{z}, d_0)p(\mathbf{z}|d_0)d\mathbf{z}} \\ &= \frac{p(d_{1:N}|\mathbf{z})p(\mathbf{z}|d_0)}{\int p(d_{1:N}|\mathbf{z})p(\mathbf{z}|d_0)d\mathbf{z}} \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{L} \frac{\prod_{n=1}^{N} p(d_n|\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}^{(l)})}{\sum_{l=1}^{L}\prod_{n=1}^{N} p(d_n|\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}^{(l)})}\delta(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^{(l)}) \\ &= \sum_{l=1}^{L} \omega_N^{(l)}\delta(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}^{(l)}), \end{aligned}$$

where we defined the weight $\omega_N^{(l)}$ as

$$\omega_N^{(l)} = \frac{\prod_{n=1}^{N} p(d_n|\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}^{(l)})}{\sum_{l=1}^{L}\prod_{n=1}^{N} p(d_n|\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}^{(l)})}. \tag{41}$$

Based on the observation equation in (4) with normally-distributed additive observation uncertainty in (6), we insert the Gaussian PDF

$$p(d_n|\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}^{(l)}) = \mathcal{N}\{\mathbf{g}\{\mathbf{z}^{(l)}\}, \sigma_{v,n}^2\}$$

into the weight calculation in (41) leading to

$$\omega_N^{(l)} = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\tilde{\omega}_n^{(l)}\right)}{\sum_{l=1}^{L}\exp\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{n=1}^{N}\tilde{\omega}_n^{(l)}\right)}, \quad \tilde{\omega}_n^{(l)} = \frac{(d_n - \mathbf{g}\{\mathbf{z}^{(l)}\})^2}{c_{\sigma,n}}, \tag{42}$$

where $c_{\sigma,n} = -(2\sigma_{v,n}^2)/N$ is proportional to the variance $\sigma_{v,n}^2$. As the exact interval length N is generally unknown in practice, we replace the arithmetic sample mean estimator in the exponential functions of (42) by a recursive estimator (often used in speech signal processing [55], [68]):

$$\omega_N^{(l)} = \frac{\exp\left(\hat{\omega}_n^{(l)}\right)}{\sum_{l=1}^{L}\exp\left(\hat{\omega}_n^{(l)}\right)}, \quad \hat{\omega}_n^{(l)} = \lambda\hat{\omega}_{n-1}^{(l)} + (1-\lambda)\tilde{\omega}_n^{(l)}, \tag{43}$$

with equal variance for an independent and identically distributed sequence $\tilde{\omega}_n^{(l)}$ $(n = 1, ..., N)$, which means that the time interval N is related to the smoothing factor λ via [69]:

$$N = (1+\lambda)/(1-\lambda). \tag{44}$$

Based on this equation, we realize a weight calculation independent of N by estimating $c_{\sigma,n}$ as follows:

$$c_{\sigma,n} = -2\sigma_{v,n}^2(1-\lambda)/(1+\lambda). \tag{45}$$

Finally, note that we initialize $\hat{\omega}_1^{(l)} = \tilde{\omega}_1^{(l)}$ for the recursive update in (43) and that various ways of selecting the smoothing factor λ have been considered in the literature, especially in the context of control charts (see e.g. [67]).

REFERENCES

[1] A. Novak, B. Maillou, P. Lotton, and L. Simon, "Nonparametric identification of nonlinear systems in series," *IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas.*, vol. 63, no. 8, pp. 2044–2051, Aug. 2014.

[2] A. Marconato, J. Sjoberg, J. A. K. Suykens, and J. Schoukens, "Improved initialization for nonlinear state-space modeling," *IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas.*, vol. 63, no. 4, pp. 972–980, Apr. 2014.

[3] C. Yu, C. Zhang, and L. Xie, "A new deterministic identification approach to Hammerstein systems," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 131–140, Jan. 2014.

[4] F. Daum, "Nonlinear filters: beyond the Kalman filter," *IEEE Aerospace, Electronic Systems Magazine*, vol. 20, no. 8, pp. 57–69, 2005.

[5] G. Li, C. Wen, W. X. Zheng, and Y. Chen, "Identification of a class of nonlinear autoregressive models with exogenous inputs based on kernel machines," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 2146–2159, May 2011.

[6] J. Kivinen, A. J. Smola, and R. C. Williamson, "Online learning with kernels," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 165 – 176, Aug. 2004.

[7] W. Liu, J. C. Príncipe, and S. Haykin, *Kernel Adaptive Filtering: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Wiley, 2010.

[8] F. Küch and W. Kellermann, "Orthogonalized power filters for nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation," *Signal Process.*, vol. 86, no. 6, pp. 1168–1181, 2006.

[9] S. Malik and G. Enzner, "Fourier expansion of Hammerstein models for nonlinear acoustic system identification," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoustics, Speech, Signal Process. (ICASSP)*, 2011, pp. 85–88.

[10] C. Hofmann, C. Huemmer, and W. Kellermann, "Significance-aware Hammerstein group models for nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoustics, Speech, Signal Process. (ICASSP)*, May 2014.

[11] A. Guérin, G. Faucon, and R. L. Bouquin-Jeannès, "Nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation based on Volterra filters," *IEEE Trans. Speech Audio Process.*, vol. 11, no. 6, pp. 672–683, Nov. 2003.

[12] M. Zeller, L. A. Azpicueta-Ruiz, J. Arenas-Garcia, and W. Kellermann, "Adaptive Volterra filters with evolutionary quadratic kernels using a combination scheme for memory control," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 1449–1464, Apr. 2011.

[13] A. Stenger, L. Trautmann, and R. Rabenstein, "Nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation with 2nd order adaptive Volterra filters," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoustics, Speech, Signal Process. (ICASSP)*, vol. 2, Mar. 1999, pp. 877–880.

[14] A. Doucet, S. Godsill, and C. Andrieu, "On sequential monte carlo sampling methods for Bayesian filtering," *Statistics computing*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 197–208, 2000.

[15] A. Doucet, N. de Freitas, and N. Gordon, *Sequential Monte Carlo Methods in Practice*. Springer, 2001.

[16] O. Cappe, S. J. Godsill, and E. Moulines, "An overview of existing methods and recent advances in sequential monte carlo," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 95, no. 5, pp. 899–924, May 2007.

[17] P. Fearnhead, "Computational methods for complex stochastic systems: a review of some alternatives to MCMC," *Statistics Computing*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 151–171, 2008.

[18] M. Pupilli and A. Calway, "Real-time camera tracking using a particle filter." in *BMVC*, 2005.

[19] M. Gokdemir and H. Vikalo, "A particle filtering algorithm for parameter estimation in real-time biosensor arrays," in *IEEE Int. Workshop Genomic Signal Process. Stat. GENSIPS*, 2009, pp. 1–4.

[20] M. M. Atia, J. Georgy, M. J. Korenberg, and A. Noureldin, "Real-time implementation of mixture particle filter for 3D RISS/GPS integrated navigation solution," *Electronics Letters*, vol. 46, no. 15, pp. 1083–1084, 2010.

[21] A. Lee, C. Yau, M. B. Giles, A. Doucet, and C. C. Holmes, "On the utility of graphics cards to perform massively parallel simulation of advanced monte carlo methods," *Journal computational graphical statistics*, vol. 19, no. 4, pp. 769–789, 2010.

[22] S. Henriksen, A. Wills, T. B. T. Schön, and B. Ninness, "Parallel implementation of particle MCMC methods on a GPU," in *Proc. 16th IFAC Symposium Syst. Ident.*, vol. 16. Citeseer, 2012, pp. 1143–1148.

[23] K. Hwang and W. Sung, "Load balanced resampling for real-time particle filtering on graphics processing units," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 411–419, Jan. 2013.

[24] M. Chitchian, A. Simonetto, A. S. van Amesfoort, and T. Keviczky, "Distributed computation particle filters on GPU architectures for real-time control applications," *IEEE Trans. Control Syst. Technol.*, vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 2224–2238, Nov. 2013.

[25] N. Gordon, D. Salmond, and A. Smith, "Novel approach to nonlinear/non-Gaussian Bayesian state estimation," in *IEE Proc. Radar, Signal Process.*, vol. 140, no. 2, Apr. 1993, pp. 107–113.

[26] D. Crisan and A. Doucet, "A survey of convergence results on particle filtering methods for practitioners," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 736–746, 2002.

[27] M. S. Arulampalam, S. Maskell, N. Gordon, and T. Clapp, "A tutorial on particle filters for online nonlinear/non-Gaussian Bayesian tracking," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 174–188, Feb. 2002.

[28] C. Andrieu, A. Doucet, S. Singh, and V. Tadić, "Particle methods for change detection, system identification, and control," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 92, no. 3, pp. 423–438, Mar. 2004.

[29] A. Doucet and A. M. Johansen, "A tutorial on particle filtering and smoothing: Fifteen years later," *Handbook Nonlinear Filtering*, vol. 12, pp. 656–704, 2009.

[30] M. Bolić, P. M. Djurić, and S. Hong, "Resampling algorithms for particle filters: A computational complexity perspective," *EURASIP Adv. Signal Process.*, no. 15, pp. 2267–2277, 2004.

[31] M. Bolić, P. Djurić, and S. Hong, "Resampling algorithms and architectures for distributed particle filters," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 53, no. 7, pp. 2442–2450, July 2005.

[32] X. Fu and Y. Jia, "An improvement on resampling algorithm of particle filters," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 5414–5420, Oct. 2010.

[33] J. H. Kotecha and P. Djurić, "Gaussian particle filtering," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 51, no. 10, pp. 2592–2601, Oct. 2003.

[34] C. Huemmer, C. Hofmann, R. Maas, A. Schwarz, and W. Kellermann, "The elitist particle filter based on evolutionary strategies as novel approach for nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Acoustics, Speech, Signal Process. (ICASSP)*, May 2014.

[35] C. M. Bishop, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Springer, 2006.

[36] C. Huemmer, R. Maas, and W. Kellermann, "The NLMS algorithm with time-variant optimum stepsize derived from a Bayesian network perspective," *IEEE Signal Process. Letters*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 1874–1878, Nov. 2015.

[37] K. Uosaki and T. Hatanaka, "Nonlinear state estimation by evolution strategies based particle filters," *2003 Congr. Evolut. Comput.*, vol. 3, pp. 2102–2109, Dec. 2003.

[38] T. Schön, "Estimation of nonlinear dynamic systems," Ph.D. dissertation, Linköpings universitet, 2006.

[39] D. Cho, S. Lee, and I. H. Suh, "Facial feature tracking using efficient particle filter and active appearance model," *Int. Journal Advanced Robotic Systems*, p. 1, June 2014.

[40] J. Zuo, "Dynamic resampling for alleviating sample impoverishment of particle filter," *IET Radar, Sonar & Navigation*, vol. 7, no. 9, pp. 968–977, Dec. 2013.

[41] T. Li, S. Sun, T. P. Sattar, and J. M. Corchado, "Review: Fight sample degeneracy and impoverishment in particle filters: A review of intelligent approaches," *Expert Syst. Appl.*, vol. 41, no. 8, pp. 3944–3954, June 2014.

[42] B. Ristic, S. Arulampalam, and N. c. Gordon, *Beyond the Kalman filter: particle filters for tracking applications*. Boston, London: Artech House, 2004.

[43] T. Bengtsson, P. Bickel, and B. Li, "Curse-of-dimensionality revisited: Collapse of the particle filter in very large scale systems," in *Probability, Statistics: Essays honor David A. Freedman, vol. 2*. Beachwood, Ohio, USA: Institute of Mathematical Statistics, 2008, pp. 316–334.

[44] F. Gustafsson, F. Gunnarsson, N. Bergman, U. Forssell, J. Jansson, R. Karlsson, and P.-J. Nordlund, "Particle filters for positioning, navigation, and tracking," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 425–437, Feb. 2002.

[45] T. Bäck and H.-P. Schwefel, "Evolutionary computation: An overview," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Conf. Evolut. Comput. (ICEC)*, May 1996, pp. 20–29.

[46] D. Foster and P. Young, "Stochastic evolutionary game dynamics," *Theoretical Population Biology*, vol. 38, no. 2, Oct. 1990.

[47] Z. Ma and A. W. Krings, "Dynamic hybrid fault modeling and extended evolutionary game theory for reliability, survivability and fault tolerance analyses," *IEEE Trans. Reliability*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 180–196, 2011.

[48] S. Zhong and F. Hao, "Hand tracking by particle filtering with elite particles mean shift," in *Proc. Japan-China Joint Workshop Front. Comp. Science, Technology (FCST)*, Dec. 2008, pp. 163–167.

[49] X.-d. Wu and Z.-h. Song, "Gaussian particle filter based pose and motion estimation," *Journal Zhejiang University SCIENCE A*, vol. 8, no. 10, pp. 1604–1613, Oct. 2007.

[50] M. Bolić, A. Athalye, S. Hong, and P. M. Djurić, "Study of algorithmic and architectural characteristics of Gaussian particle filters," *Journal Signal Process. Systems*, vol. 61, no. 2, pp. 205–218, Nov. 2010.
[51] J. Lim and D. Hong, "Gaussian particle filtering approach for carrier frequency offset estimation in OFDM systems," *IEEE Signal Process. Letters*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 367–370, Apr. 2013.
[52] A. Rao, H. Wang, Z.-C. Hu, and J. Mullane, "A Gaussian particle filter based factorised solution to the simultaneous localization and mapping problem," in *IEEE Workshop Advanced Robot. Social Impacts (ARSO)*, 2013, pp. 113–118.
[53] A. Stenger and W. Kellermann, "Adaptation of a memoryless preprocessor for nonlinear acoustic echo cancelling," *Signal Process.*, vol. 80, no. 9, pp. 1747 – 1760, 2000.
[54] C. Huemmer, C. Hofmann, R. Maas, and W. Kellermann, "The significance-aware EPFES to estimate a memoryless preprocessor for nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation," in *Proc. IEEE Global Conf. Signal Information Process. (GlobalSIP)*, Dec. 2014.
[55] S. Haykin, *Adaptive Filter Theory*. Prentice Hall, 2002.
[56] S. Shimauchi and Y. Haneda, "Nonlinear acoustic echo cancellation based on piecewise linear approximation with amplitude threshold decomposition," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Workshop Acoustic Signal Enhanc. (IWAENC)*, Sep. 2012, pp. 1–4.
[57] E. Alba and C. Cotta, "Evolutionary algorithms," *Handbook Bioinspired Algorithms, Applications*, pp. 3–19, 2006.
[58] Z. Michalewicz, *Genetic Algorithms + Data Structures = Evolution Programs*. Springer, 1996.
[59] D. Whitley, "Using reproductive evaluation to improve genetic search and heuristic discovery," in *Proc. Second Int. Conf. Genetic Algorithms*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1987.
[60] F. Fernandez, L. Vanneschi, and M. Tomassini, "The effect of plagues in genetic programming: A study of variable-size populations," in *Genetic Programming*. Springer, 2003, pp. 317–326.
[61] M. Lozano, F. Herrera, and J. R. Cano, "Replacement strategies to preserve useful diversity in steady-state genetic algorithms," *Information Sciences*, vol. 178, no. 23, pp. 4421–4433, 2008.
[62] C. Cotta and J. M. Troya, "Information processing in transmitting recombination," *Applied Mathematics Letters*, vol. 16, no. 6, pp. 945–948, 2003.
[63] A. Eiben and J. E. Smith, *Introduction to Evolutionary Computing*. Springer, 2003.
[64] A. Eiben, P.-E. Rau, and Z. Ruttkay, *Genetic Algorithms With Multi-Parent Recombination*. Springer, 1994, vol. 866, pp. 78–87.
[65] E. Cant-Paz, "Order statistics and selection methods of evolutionary algorithms," *Information Process. Letters*, vol. 82, no. 1, pp. 15–22, 2002.
[66] D. E. Goldberg and K. Deb, "A comparative analysis of selection schemes used in genetic algorithms," in *Foundations Genetic Algorithms*, 1991, pp. 69–93.
[67] J. M. Lucas and M. S. Saccucci, "Exponentially weighted moving average control schemes: properties and enhancements," *Technometrics*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 1–12, Feb. 1990.
[68] E. Hänsler and G. Schmidt, *Acoustic echo and noise control : a practical approach*. J. Wiley and sons, 2004.
[69] H. J.S., "The exponentially weighted moving average," *Journal Quality Technology*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 203–210, Oct. 1986.